



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

### **Social as much as environmental: the drivers of tree biomass in smallholder forest landscape restoration programmes**

**Citation for published version:**

Wells, G, Fisher, J, Jindal, R & Ryan, C 2020, 'Social as much as environmental: the drivers of tree biomass in smallholder forest landscape restoration programmes', *Environmental Research Letters*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab96d1>

**Digital Object Identifier (DOI):**

[10.1088/1748-9326/ab96d1](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab96d1)

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Peer reviewed version

**Published In:**

Environmental Research Letters

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT • OPEN ACCESS

## Social as much as environmental: the drivers of tree biomass in smallholder forest landscape restoration programmes

To cite this article before publication: Geoff Wells *et al* 2020 *Environ. Res. Lett.* in press <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab96d1>

### Manuscript version: Accepted Manuscript

Accepted Manuscript is “the version of the article accepted for publication including all changes made as a result of the peer review process, and which may also include the addition to the article by IOP Publishing of a header, an article ID, a cover sheet and/or an ‘Accepted Manuscript’ watermark, but excluding any other editing, typesetting or other changes made by IOP Publishing and/or its licensors”

This Accepted Manuscript is © 2020 The Author(s). Published by IOP Publishing Ltd.

As the Version of Record of this article is going to be / has been published on a gold open access basis under a CC BY 3.0 licence, this Accepted Manuscript is available for reuse under a CC BY 3.0 licence immediately.

Everyone is permitted to use all or part of the original content in this article, provided that they adhere to all the terms of the licence <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0>

Although reasonable endeavours have been taken to obtain all necessary permissions from third parties to include their copyrighted content within this article, their full citation and copyright line may not be present in this Accepted Manuscript version. Before using any content from this article, please refer to the Version of Record on IOPscience once published for full citation and copyright details, as permissions may be required. All third party content is fully copyright protected and is not published on a gold open access basis under a CC BY licence, unless that is specifically stated in the figure caption in the Version of Record.

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

# Social as much as environmental: the drivers of tree biomass in smallholder forest landscape restoration programmes

Geoff J. Wells<sup>1</sup>, Janet Fisher<sup>2</sup>, Rohit Jindal<sup>3</sup>, Casey Ryan<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Stockholm Resilience Centre, Stockholm University

<sup>2</sup> School of GeoSciences, University of Edinburgh

<sup>3</sup> Department of Decision Sciences, MacEwan University

Corresponding author: [geoff.wells@su.se](mailto:geoff.wells@su.se)

**Data availability:** the data of the study are available upon request to the authors.

## Abstract

A major challenge for forest landscape restoration initiatives is the lack of quantitative evidence on how social factors drive environmental outcomes. Here we conduct a transdisciplinary quantitative analysis of the environmental and social drivers of tree biomass accumulation across 639 smallholder farms restoring native tree species in Mexico, Uganda and Mozambique. We use environmental and social data to assess the relative effects of key hypothesised drivers on aboveground biomass accumulation at the farm-level over ten years. We supplement this with a qualitative analysis of perspectives from local farmers and agroforestry technicians on the potential causal mechanisms of the observed social effects. We find that the material wellbeing of farmers (e.g. assets) and access to agroforestry knowledge explain as much variation in biomass as water availability. Local perspectives suggest that this is caused by the higher adaptive capacity of some farmers and their associated ability to respond to social-ecological shocks and stresses. Additionally, the variation in biomass between farms increased over time. Local perspectives suggested that this was caused by emergent exogenous and stochastic influences which cannot be reliably predicted in technical analyses and guidance. To deal with this persistent uncertainty, local perspectives emphasised the need for flexible and adaptive processes at the farm- and village-levels. The consistency of these findings across three countries suggests these findings are relevant to similar forest restoration interventions. Our findings provide novel quantitative evidence of a social-ecological pathway where the adaptive capacity of local land users can improve ecological processes. Our findings emphasize the need for forest restoration programmes to prioritise investment in the capabilities of local land users, and to ensure that rules support, rather than hinder, adaptive management.

## 33 Introduction

34 Forest landscape restoration (FLR) initiatives are at the forefront of efforts to reverse  
35 environmental degradation in terrestrial ecosystems (Chazdon et al., 2017). The success of  
36 FLR initiatives, however, has so far has been mixed (J. Aronson & Alexander, 2013;  
37 Mansourian et al., 2017).

38 A major challenge for restoration and other land management schemes is the difficulty of  
39 predicting, controlling and managing the outcomes of interventions in what are often highly  
40 complex and variable social-ecological systems (Messier et al., 2015). There is ongoing  
41 debate on the drivers of FLR outcomes, with different perspectives giving varying levels of  
42 emphasis to environmental and social factors. Some emphasise biophysical aspects and the  
43 need to build and support the integrity of ecological communities—there may be social  
44 benefits, but objectives can be primarily ecological, knowledge is technical, and minimising  
45 human intervention is seen as key (J. C. Aronson et al., 2018; Brudvig et al., 2017; Higgs et  
46 al., 2018; Suding et al., 2015; Temperton et al., 2019). Others emphasise the importance of  
47 institutional and social contexts that support good governance and adaptive management for  
48 sustainable and socially beneficial restoration (Mansourian, 2016; Van Oosten, 2013b). This  
49 divergence of perspectives on the drivers of environmental outcomes also extends to the  
50 related fields of conservation and payments for ecosystem services (Ezzine-de-Blas et al.,  
51 2016; Naeem et al., 2015; Pascual et al., 2014; Soule, 2013), and to the fields of land  
52 system science where existing models and approaches continue to struggle to integrate  
53 local-level social factors and context (Stephanson and Mascia, 2014; Iwamura et al., 2018).  
54 Effective interdisciplinary approaches to FLR and similar interventions remain rare (Huber-  
55 Stearns et al., 2017; Mansourian et al., 2017).

56 One of the key gaps in interdisciplinary FLR remains the quantification of how local (e.g.  
57 household-level) social factors drive biophysical outcomes, and clear knowledge on their  
58 causality (Chazdon et al., 2017; Wortley et al., 2013). While the field of restoration ecology  
59 has generated a wealth of quantitative empirical research on how environmental aspects  
60 drive outcomes (Perring et al., 2015), due to the difficulty of measuring social phenomena,  
61 ex-post quantitative field studies testing the effects of social drivers have remained rare  
62 (Geist & Galatowitsch, 1999; Kibler et al., 2018; Le et al., 2012; Miller & Hobbs, 2007;  
63 Sapkota et al., 2018).

64 In the land systems, forest transition and FLR literature, existing ex-post field studies that do  
65 cover the social drivers of biophysical outcomes have mainly focused on showing how socio-  
66 economic factors influence land users to join a scheme (e.g. Baynes et al., 2017; Mullan and  
67 Kontoleon, 2012; Yin et al., 2010). While useful for targeting initial tree planting, there  
68 remains a dearth of field studies quantitatively assessing how social drivers effect  
69 biophysical outcomes (e.g. tree growth) at the local level. The few field studies that do  
70 assess biophysical outcomes have mainly focused on broad assessments of project-level  
71 factors such as institutional design and economic incentives, and have found that social  
72 drivers are secondary to environmental drivers (Le et al., 2014; Yackulic et al., 2011).  
73 However, such project-level assessment likely miss the great social diversity at sub-project  
74 (e.g. household) levels which likely has great effect on land management and tree care  
75 (Nahuelhual et al., 2018; Pritchard et al., 2018; Tittonell et al., 2005).

A consequence of the lack of fine-grained social analyses, is that models and guidance for predicting and managing FLR outcomes are often focused on technical, largely environmental, factors (Wortley et al., 2013). On the other hand, in implementation, land management schemes are challenged to contend with a much broader array of both social and environmental factors (Van Oosten, 2013). Generating quantitative evidence on the relative importance and causal mechanisms of social factors remains a research frontier for FLR and other land management interventions (Chazdon et al., 2017).

Here we begin to address this gap through an novel ex-post, field-based interdisciplinary quantitative analysis of environmental and social drivers of tree biomass accumulation across 639 smallholder agroforestry farms restoring native tree species in projects in Mexico, Uganda and Mozambique. To our knowledge this is the first such quantitative analysis of its kind. Additionally, as we will elaborate, the consistency of our results across three countries strengthens the generalisability of our findings to similar land management interventions.

Agroforestry with native species is increasingly advocated as a key method of FLR, where farmers can increase native tree cover while maintaining crop production in agricultural landscapes (Erdmann, 2005; Robiglio & Reyes, 2016; Schroth et al., 2011). Smallholders are estimated to manage approximately 75% of the world's agricultural land (Lowder et al., 2016), and to make up most of the world's poor (Morton, 2007). Thus, many FLR initiatives, and particularly those in developing countries, will engage smallholders—and native-species agroforestry offers a key way to do this.

We focus on five key environmental and social factors theorised (by both experts and local land users) to drive biomass outcomes in such interventions: water availability; soil quality; existing tree cover at time of planting; household wealth and living standards (henceforth 'material wellbeing'; White, 2010); and household access to agroforestry knowledge. The environmental variables cover the key ecological considerations in designing agroforestry systems: sufficient water and soil nutrients are fundamental for tree growth, while tree cover at the time of planting serves as a proxy for inter-plant competition (Ashton & Montagnini, 1999; Corona-Núñez et al., 2018).

For social drivers, dimensions of household material wellbeing have been shown to be key factors in determining smallholder land management and resource use—people with different levels of deprivation have different capacities to manage land, and rely on different resources (Nahuelhual et al., 2018; Pritchard et al., 2018; Tittonell et al., 2005). For access to agroforestry knowledge, both vertical (expert to farmer) and horizontal (farmer to farmer) extension services (Altieri & Toledo, 2011) have been associated with the successful uptake of new land management techniques amongst smallholders (Baird et al., 2016; Clark et al., 2011).

More broadly, access to assets and knowledge are theorised to be central to the adaptive capacity, and associated resilience, of actors in natural resource management—a key factor underpinning the achievement of land management objectives despite emergent shocks and stressors (Thiault et al., 2019). For FLR, social factors, extension services and associated adaptive capacity are postulated to be key enabling factors for successful outcomes (Chazdon et al., 2017; Yin et al., 2013).

Our research questions are: which of the hypothesised environmental and social drivers have had the greatest effect on the AGB of trees established on agroforestry restoration farms? What are the causal mechanisms of the social effects? What are the implications for smallholder agroforestry, and other, FLR projects?

## Methods

### *Study design*

We use tree inventories, social surveys, spatiotemporal biophysical datasets, biomass modelling and mixed effects models to assess the relative effects of a set of hypothesised environmental and social drivers on the accumulation of aboveground biomass (AGB) at the farm-level across all three projects. We focus on AGB as a key metric for understanding changes in forest landscapes (Goetz et al., 2015), acknowledging that the benefits of trees in these landscapes go far beyond biomass. We identified the hypothesised drivers with reference to both the literature and interviews with local farmers and agroforestry technicians (details below). We also used these interviews to supplement the quantitative analysis with local perspectives on the potential causal mechanisms of the observed social effects.

### *Study areas*

Our study sites cover farms participating in three smallholder agroforestry schemes: Scolel'te in Chiapas State in southern Mexico; Trees for Global Benefits in the districts of Rubrizi, Mitooma, Kasese, Hoima and Masindi in western Uganda; and the Sofala Community Carbon Programme in Sofala Province in central Mozambique (Figure 1). The farms in Mexico occur across a 240 km section of the highlands in Chiapas, along an ecological gradient from montane tropical rainforests to subtropical pine-oak rainforests (De Jong et al., 1995, p. 99). Farmers are from a diverse range of villages, spanning five culturally distinct *Maya* linguistic groups, and *mestizo* farmers of mixed descent (Ruiz-De-Oña-Plaza et al., 2011). In Uganda, sites occur along a 330 km section of the Albertine Rift characterised by crater lakes and tropical high forests. Farmers are members of a range of different *Bantu* linguistic groups (ECOTRUST, 2018). In Mozambique, sites are spread across a 30 km area of tropical open miombo woodland (sometimes classified as savannah) bordering the Gorongosa National Park (Ryan et al., 2011; Woollen et al., 2012). Farmers generally share *Sena* as their local language and are comprised of both long term residents and refugees who have settled in the 1990s following the Mozambican civil war (Hegde et al., 2015).

Figure 1. Maps of the regions covered in the study.



Each project implemented its own types of agroforestry with different species and management protocols, designed for different existing land uses and bioclimatic zones (Table 1). The different existing land uses and species likely imply different natural growth rates, and different levels of tree management and care. To enable an analysis across agroforestry types and bioclimatic zones, we use a relative measure of biomass accumulation which controls for different land uses, species and management (see Methods). Each village in the project relied on its own nursery for tree saplings. Assuming sapling quality varies with nursery, to control for variation in sapling quality we nested our analysis at the village level.

While socio-ecologically diverse, all regions share similar levels of variance on the key variables in our analysis (Table 2, in bold). Additionally, all can be categorised as remote areas dominated by subsistence agriculture and/or livestock systems, with high levels of poverty by global and national standards (OPHI, 2015, 2018a, 2018b). Additionally, all three schemes are funded by a mix of donor funds and carbon credits generated under the Plan Vivo Carbon Certification system (Plan Vivo, 2013). They thus have similar organisational processes and land management objectives, where a local organisation employs local technicians to help farmers to restore native tree species, and to monitor tree growth for 10 years after planting. These project processes are integrated with existing village institutions to varying degrees.

173 **Table 1. Summary of agroforestry types and land uses**

Agroforestry type	Description
Live fence, Mexico	Planting of <i>Cedrela odorata</i> around the edge of existing arable fields or areas of pasture. Initial minimum tree spacing of 3m (a stocking density of 133 stems around a one ha. field).
Intercropping, Mexico	Establishment of forestry plantations of <i>C. odorata</i> and <i>Swietenia macrophylla</i> alongside existing annual agricultural crops. Initial minimum stocking density of 333 stems per ha.
Coffee, Mexico	Enrichment planting of <i>C. odorata</i> to provide shade in coffee plantations. Initial minimum stocking density of 180 stems per ha.
Improved fallow, Mexico	Planting of <i>Pinus oocarpa</i> and <i>Quercus spp.</i> on long term fallows or areas unsuited for agriculture. Initial minimum stocking density of 475 stems per ha.
Live fence, Mozambique	Planting of native hard wood tree species (typical of miombo woodland) around the edge of existing arable fields. Initial minimum tree spacing of 4m (a stocking density of 84 stems around a one ha. field).
Intercropping, Uganda	Establishment of forestry plantations of <i>Maesopsis eminii</i> alongside existing annual agricultural crops. Initial minimum stocking density of 333 stems per ha.

174 **Sampling**

175 We analysed 639 randomly-selected households and their associated agroforestry farms  
 176 (259 in Mexico, 321 in Uganda and 59 in Mozambique). In Mexico and Mozambique, we  
 177 excluded farms for which we had insufficient social variables. Assessments of missing  
 178 values showed no structure to the missingness, implying values were missing at random—  
 179 and thus that our overall sample can continue to be considered random (Kowarik & Templ,  
 180 2016). Our sampling frame covers populations of farmers who opted to participate in FLR in  
 181 three different countries. We therefore interpret our results as case studies having relevance  
 182 to similar interventions (Yin 2014).

183 **Data: relative aboveground biomass**

184 To generate farm-level estimates of AGB per hectare, we used farm-level tree inventories,  
 185 the pantropical allometric models provided by Chave et al. (2009, 2014); and the BIOMASS  
 186 package in R (Rejou-Mechain et al., 2018). Tree inventories were census-style surveys,  
 187 measuring all planted trees on the farms and recording species, tree diameter-at-breast-  
 188 height (DBH; approx. 1.3m), tree height, wood density and plot location. Height was  
 189 recorded for all trees (including saplings), while DBH was measured for all trees with DBH  
 190  $\geq 5$ cm. The BIOMASS packages in R package accounts for variation in allometry by



bioclimatic zone based on the expected location of the plot. We used Monte Carlo simulation to generate 95% credibility intervals (CI) of AGB on each farm.

Each project implemented different styles of agroforestry (Table 1), with different tree communities for different bioclimatic zones, and so different expected rates of biomass accumulation. To enable comparisons of performance between agroforestry styles and bioclimatic zones, and plots of different ages we calculated a measure of relative aboveground biomass (RAGB). First, we used chronosequences (Walker et al., 2010) and least square log-linear regressions (Paine et al., 2012) to find the expected 'average' AGB per hectare for a particular year (up to 10 years since planting) for a given agroforestry style. We then extracted for each farm the adjusted standardised pearson residuals (i.e. the deviation of the farm AGB from the expected AGB, in standard error units; similar to a z-score) as an indicator of relative performance (Sorice et al. 2014; Kastenholz et al. 2007; Maschinski et al. 1997). We used the conservative RAGB value for each farm (the lower 95% CI RAGB for farms with mean RAGB > 0, and the upper 95% RAGB for farms with mean RAGB < 0, where RAGB = 0 indicates average performance).

#### *Data: environmental explanatory variables*

For water availability, we modelled the mean annual climatic water deficit (CWD; potential evapotranspiration minus actual evapotranspiration) since planting on each farm (for a similar approach see Poorter et al. 2016) using farm location data, global spatio-temporal records of temperature and rainfall since tree planting (data from Willmot et al. 2014; digital-elevation-model assisted interpolation from weather station records to 0.5 degree resolution), digital elevation models (INEGI, 2018; USGS, 2006; 30m resolution) and the CWD R function from Redmond (2015). For soil quality, we used estimates of cation exchange capacity (CEC) from the ISRIC SoilGrids global spatial datasets (Hengl et al. 2017; from soil field measurements extrapolated using 158 remote-sensing-based soil covariates at 250m resolution). For existing tree cover, we used farm locations and assessments of tree cover from spectral Landsat and MODIS remote sensing data (Sexton et al., 2013; 30m resolution) to estimate the proportion of tree cover on the plot in the year of planting. We also included the initial stocking density of tree on each plot as a supplementary measure of competition., and the size of the farm to check for bias from farm size (e.g. the overestimation of biomass on smaller farms).

Data on CWD, CEC and initial tree cover are at a coarser resolution than all other variables, which all operate at the farm-level or similar scales. The spatial mismatch between CWD and CEC and our outcome measurements increases the likelihood of random error in the modelling, which would weaken their effects in the regression analysis. Nonetheless, we include these variables to assess whether broad variation in these soil and climate variables have an overwhelmingly large effect on biomass accumulation that renders social factors obsolete.

#### *Data: social explanatory variables*

For material wellbeing, we constructed an index of multi-dimensional material wellbeing using similar indicators and the same 'counting' approach as the widely-used global multidimensional poverty indicator (MPI; see Alkire & Jahan, 2018). Data were sourced from household surveys conducted with the randomly selected farmers in each country. All

**Table 2. Descriptive statistics of variables.** Variables in bold are included in the main model.

	Mexico		Mozambique		Uganda	
Variable	n	Mean $\pm$ SD (% for binary)	n	Mean $\pm$ SD (% for binary)	n	Mean $\pm$ SD (% for binary)
Travel time to city (mins)	259	154.45 $\pm$ 84.18	59	225.42 $\pm$ 16.75	321	71.01 $\pm$ 23.68
Amount land (ha)	259	9.38 $\pm$ 6.74	59	1.51 $\pm$ 1.45	321	10.76 $\pm$ 14.67
Literacy	259	93%	59	44%	321	74%
Valuable assets (2nd model only)	259	52%	59	12%	83	29%
Above primary schooling 2nd model only)	259	53%	59	17%	60	25%
Employment contract (2nd model only)	106	8%	59	15%	85	11%
Formal land tenure	259	80%	59	51%	321	24%
People in household	259	4.27 $\pm$ 1.4	59	6.22 $\pm$ 1.92	321	8.71 $\pm$ 0.88
<b>Wellbeing index (main model: simpler, full sample)</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>3.93 <math>\pm</math> 1.91</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>2.29 <math>\pm</math> 0.89</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>1.99 <math>\pm</math> 1.01</b>
Wellbeing index (2nd model only: broader, partial sample)	106	5.06 $\pm$ 2.13	59	2.73 $\pm$ 1.16	60	1.68 $\pm$ 1.13
Village AF experience (years)	259	4.61 $\pm$ 2.8	59	2.54 $\pm$ 2.28	321	2.5 $\pm$ 2.3
Technician in village	259	85%	59	36%	321	70%
<b>Extension services index</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>1.27 <math>\pm</math> 0.47</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>0.59 <math>\pm</math> 0.56</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>0.93 <math>\pm</math> 0.55</b>
<b>Tree cover at planting (%/ha)</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>42.59 <math>\pm</math> 13.06</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>10.04 <math>\pm</math> 3.18</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>7.87 <math>\pm</math> 2.36</b>
<b>Cation exchange capacity (cmol+/kg)</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>25.92 <math>\pm</math> 3.54</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>9.38 <math>\pm</math> 0.87</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>15.79 <math>\pm</math> 3.49</b>
<b>Mean climatic water deficit (mm/yr)</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>-296.35 <math>\pm</math> 139.11</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>-399.15 <math>\pm</math> 119.75</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>-294.7 <math>\pm</math> 128.5</b>
<b>Initial planting density (stems/ha)</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>426.85 <math>\pm</math> 242.68</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>75 <math>\pm</math> 6.27</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>365.09 <math>\pm</math> 24.21</b>
<b>Farm size (ha)</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>1.01 <math>\pm</math> 0.43</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>1.1 <math>\pm</math> 0.94</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>1.67 <math>\pm</math> 1.31</b>
<b>Relative aboveground biomass</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>0.01 <math>\pm</math> 0.74</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>0 <math>\pm</math> 0.57</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>0.01 <math>\pm</math> 0.79</b>

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

235  
236 surveys were conducted face-to-face with the person responsible for managing the farm (i.e.  
237 usually the farm owner). Interviews were conducted with the help of a local translator (see  
238 S1 in the Supplementary Material for further details). We followed a similar approach to  
239 construct an index of access to extension services based indicators identified from local  
240 consultations and the existing literature (Altieri & Toledo, 2011; Birner et al., 2009; Krishna,  
241 2004). All quantitative variables are summarised at Table 2.

242 *Data: local perspectives on causality*

243 To better frame our hypotheses, and to understand how social drivers operate, we  
244 conducted semi-structured interviews with 39 farmers and 23 technicians during field visits to  
245 Mexico, Uganda and Mozambique (29 in Mexico, 13 in Uganda and 20 in Mozambique). We  
246 used a purposive sample to speak to farmers with varying levels of AGB performance and  
247 the main technicians associated with those farms. We conducted these interviews as broad,  
248 semi-structured conversations about the respondent's experience throughout the project,  
249 including open questions on why some farmers have bigger or different trees compared to  
250 others. Interviews were conducted with prior informed consent and anonymity was  
251 maintained throughout. We documented interviews in notes and audio recordings,  
252 sometimes with the assistance of translators fluent in the local languages.

253 *Analysis*


254 For the quantitative analysis, we used linear mixed models with REML estimation, and  
255 village and country as a random effect (minimum of 12 households per village). Diagnostics  
256 indicated a suitable fit with normally distributed residuals with homogenous variance and no  
257 significant collinearity among independent variables (Zuur et al., 2007). We also  
258 subsequently conducted a likelihood ratio test to check the significance of the random effect  
259 of village (Kuznetsova et al., 2017). Given the varying resolution of the variables in our  
260 analyses, we used variograms to assess the spatial dependence of all independent variables  
261 and the dependent variable (RAGB), and global tests of Moran's I and correlograms to  
262 assess spatial autocorrelation in the residuals of the main model. We also plotted model  
263 residuals against farm size to check for bias in biomass estimates from large trees on small  
264 farm sizes. All analyses were performed in R, version 3.5.1 (R Core Team, 2019), and the  
265 model code and diagnostics are in the Supplementary Material, section S3. For the  
266 qualitative analysis, we used a thematic analysis (Ritchie et al. 2013) to frame the  
267 hypotheses around material wellbeing and agroforestry knowledge and, following the  
268 quantitative analysis, to examine in more depth the possible causal mechanisms behind the  
269 observed social effects. We include illustrative (anonymised) quotes from respondents in the  
270 results.

271 **Results**

272 Across our sites, farm-level AGB varied greatly, and this variation increased over time  
273 (Figure 2).

274

**Figure 2. Boxplots showing variation in aboveground biomass between farms of different ages.** The boxplots show quantiles, while the points are individual farms (horizontally jittered to the width of the boxplot). Tree stocking densities are a main determinant of AGB per ha, and target stocking densities varied between the different agroforestry styles included in the study. Here we show farm-level AGB for all land uses, normalised to a stocking density of 100 stems per ha.



Perspectives from farmers and local technicians suggested that this reflects the great and inherent social-ecological diversity amongst smallholdings, even across small areas (Box 1).

#### **Box 1. Local perspectives on social-ecological diversity**

Every farm is different. The soil changes from one farm to the other. Some are closer to the [existing rainforest] so they get more vines and shade. People also want to do different things on their farms.

*Farmer, Mexico*

People are not the same, so having one [agroforestry] plan does not work. You need several options with some flexibility. Some people like different trees because of the fruit or medicines. Also some trees grow better in some places but we don't really understand why. Even the [forest ecologists] don't know.

*Agroforestry technician, Uganda*

Local actors also suggested that following the establishment (tree planting) phase, land managers will lose control over outcomes as emergent social-ecological factors outside of their influence come to bear (Box 2).

**Box 2. Local perspectives on a loss of control over emergent social-ecological factors**

There have been big social and environmental changes since the beginning of the project. In some places there were floods, and in other years there were small fires. Other years it was ok. Also there are now more people and less land. [The project processes] had to change but you can't control everything.

*Agroforestry technician, Mexico*

It was easy [to grow trees] at first, but then some [farms] do better than others. We had a dry year, so people that had just then planted now have smaller trees. Some people did a better job at watering [the saplings], but even then that didn't always work.


*Farmer, Mozambique*

In the regression analysis, the social factors of household material wellbeing and access to extension services each explained similar amounts of variation in RAGB to that explained by climatic water deficit (Figure 3). Cation exchange capacity, tree cover and initial planting density had no significant effects. The relative homogeneity of residuals across countries (Supplementary Material, Section S3a.i), and supplementary individual regressions for the limited sample sizes in each country (Supplementary Material, Section S3b), indicate that these results are robust across our sites. Additionally, farm size had no apparent influence on the model residuals (S3a.ii), indicating that the results are robust to the influence of large trees on small farms.

Our results also appear robust to spatial autocorrelation (Supplementary Material, Section S3d). While variograms indicate strong spatial dependence of some of our environmental independent variables (CWD, CEC and initial tree cover), all other independent variables and our dependent variables appear strongly spatially independent. Crucially, correlograms of Moran's I of model residuals found no significant spatial dependence at different spatial lags in Uganda and Mozambique, and only a very weak dependence at very large spatial scales in Mexico (Moran's I = 0.05,  $p < 0.01$ , at distance class midpoint of 1.33 decimal degrees; 148km at the equator).

Broadly, these results suggest that social factors have a measurable impact on biomass accumulation. Given that variability in AGB increases over time and that we only model growth in the first ten years since planting, effects are likely to be greater by the time trees reach maturity (25 to 40 years). Our conclusions on the relative influence of the environmental factors of CWD, CEC and initial tree cover are limited by the coarser resolution these variables. However, we view that the lack of significantly larger effects of these environmental variables relative to social variables does emphasise that both are integral to biomass accumulation in FLR schemes.

**Figure 3. Effects of hypothesised drivers on relative aboveground biomass.**  
Standardised estimates with 95% confidence intervals. \* = significant with 95% confidence



The inclusion of village as a random effect significantly improved the model fit ( $X^2 = 46.77$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $N = 639$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), indicating that farms associated with the same village performed similarly. Conversely, however, there was low spatial auto-correlation of RAGB in Mexico (Moran's  $I = 0.23$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) and Uganda (Moran's  $I = 0.14$ ,  $p = 0.02$ ) (Mozambique had an insufficient sample for a robust assessment). These results combine to indicate that there are additional drivers operating at the village level and that they are not strongly spatial.

These statistical associations correspond with the consistent perspective amongst farmers and technicians that farmers with greater individual capabilities, and more supportive village institutions, were better able to innovate and adapt their land management in response to changing social and environmental conditions. Essentially, farmers with sufficient capabilities appear more able to overcome environmental barriers to tree growth by having more time, labor and knowledge to allocate to the care of their trees (Box 3)

### Box 3. Local perspectives linking social factors, adaptive capacity and tree growth

It is easier for richer people, or people with a bigger group to help, because they have more labour ... and money is also important. When things happen, you can use the money to deal with it.

*Farmer, Mexico*

It was difficult because it was hard to do something new. Some of the trees didn't work because of the drought, then my husband got sick and it was difficult to fix things

*Farmer, Mozambique*

It was always harder when there is no one else doing agroforestry in the village. Farmers need to learn what works and this is always easier in a group, or when someone has done it already.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

358

Agroforestry technicians, Uganda

I lived next door to the house where the [agroforestry technicians] would stay. It helped to have them next door. They would always come and give advice which helped the trees.

Farmer, Mozambique

More broadly, while our modelling showed some significant effects, most of the variation in AGB remained unexplained, despite the fact that we had accounted for (to the best of our ability) the major drivers suggested by local stakeholders and the technical literature. While our use of a relative measure of biomass accumulation, and the nesting of our analysis at village level, controls for broad differences in species, sapling quality and land management, residual variation is likely explained by other ecological (e.g. disturbance; species interactions; micro-climates) and social factors (e.g. the nuances of household participation in resource governance institutions; within-household interactions) not covered in our analysis. Combined with local perspectives on the inherent variability and dynamism of the social-ecological system (Box 1), this suggests that there are no simple explanations for variation in land management outcomes in our systems – drivers are likely diverse and very hard to measure and predict. In this context of continued uncertainty, local perspectives emphasised the importance of adaptive learning at the project, village and farm levels. As an agroforestry technician in Uganda told us: “New things arrive in the project that you cannot anticipate. So we need to be flexible if we can, while still caring for the trees and forest. When changes come, we all change as one.”

**Discussion**

In this study, we find strong quantitative evidence that the material wellbeing and knowledge of farmers are key drivers of biomass accumulation in smallholder agroforestry FLR interventions. To the best of our knowledge, this phenomenon has not previously been demonstrated quantitatively using ex-post field data linking directly to biophysical outcomes. Additionally, the quantitative evidence suggests that these factors operate at both the village and household levels.

Local perspectives emphasised that the broad causal mechanism for these social effects was that farmers with more resources and knowledge, and better support from village institutions, were better able to adapt their land use to emergent social-ecological shocks and stresses. This reaffirms existing theories on the importance of individual adaptive capacity and adaptive cogovernance for land management programmes (Thiault et al., 2019).

Our findings apply across sites in three countries. Given the need for FLR and other restoration programmes to engage rural smallholders in developing countries, we contend that our results are of relevance to the broader restoration field, and other land management interventions such as conservation and payments for ecosystem service schemes. Below we highlight two key contributions.

*Social resilience and adaptive capacity drive restoration outcomes*

A part of the restoration literature continues to view social factors and objectives as secondary (albeit admirable) considerations for restoration initiatives, relative to more important biophysical considerations (Aronson & Alexander, 2013; Higgs et al., 2018; Suding et al., 2015; Temperton et al., 2019). This view is also prominent in part of the associated conservation and payments for ecosystem services literatures, where social objectives are sometimes seen as aspirational but not integral (and sometimes as a distraction) to technical and biophysical factors (Ezzine-de-Blas et al., 2016; Naeem et al., 2015; Soule, 2013).

Our results provide robust empirical evidence demonstrating that the social situation of local resource users has a significant, tangible effect on biophysical restoration outcomes. This accords with existing literature on the importance of social factors supporting good governance (Mansourian, 2016; Van Oosten, 2013; Baynes et al. 2013), and extends this to emphasise the importance of supporting the adaptive capacity of individual participants. It also contrasts with coarser (e.g. project-level) analyses which have found no effect from social factors on biomass accumulation in FLR project (Le et al., 2014). By analysing at the household-level we have uncovered novel evidence on how social diversity drives biomass outcomes.

While improvements in ecological processes are often theorised to benefit humans (Díaz et al., 2018; Chazdon and Brancalion, 2019), here we have clear evidence of a reciprocal pathway: in certain contexts improvements to human capabilities can benefit ecological processes. Essentially, the effectiveness of a land management intervention may only be as good as the social-economic resilience and adaptive capacity of its local participants. Restoration, and related conservation and payments for ecosystem services projects, should thus put such factors on par with biophysical and other technical considerations.

One interpretation of this finding could be that restoration and similar programmes should avoid engaging poorer people with low capabilities. However, where interventions are aiming for a socially beneficial and landscape-level transformation, excluding more vulnerable people is likely not an option. On the social side, interventions would need to consider the social impacts of excluding already vulnerable and marginalised people from natural resource management programmes, and the related risk of elite capture (Persha & Andersson, 2014). Excluding particular actors could also have knock on effects on community support for the project, and associated local perceptions of project legitimacy (Pascual et al., 2014). Regarding landscape-level transformation, excluding particular actors could restrict interventions to site-level rather than landscape-level interventions, which would likely not achieve the changes that many hope for (Chazdon et al., 2016; Lamb et al., 2005). It could also drive 'leakage' where conservation of one place in the landscape just moves degradation elsewhere (Bode et al., 2015). Programmes seeking socially beneficial, landscape-level change will thus likely need to engage many actors, including vulnerable people. Allocating resources and designing institutions to supporting the adaptive capacity and capabilities of local resource users will be key. This will be particularly important for engaging smallholders, who are often poorer and control much of the world's land (Lowder et al., 2016; Morton, 2007).

*Accepting uncertainty and supporting adaptive management*



A second key finding of our study is that great variability in land management outcomes may be the norm rather than the exception in smallholder FLR and similar projects, even amongst sites in similar areas with similar land use objectives. Further, this variability likely increases over time. Local perspectives suggest that, rather than technical staff and FLR administrators progressively refining their knowledge and management of the system to reduce variability in outcomes, such actors may in fact begin to lose influence over land management outcomes after the initial establishment of the system. After this, exogenous and stochastic influences may come to dominate, and early differences in the quality of tree planting are exacerbated, pushing the system beyond the predictive and managerial control of land analysts and users.

Alongside our findings about local adaptive capacity, this emphasises the need to moderate expectations of being able to accurately design and predict interventions and outcomes (Brudvig et al., 2017). Instead our evidence supports calls to invest in flexible rules and institutions that support rather than hinder adaptive management in restoration and related initiatives (Mansourian et al., 2017; Murray & Marmorek, 2003). Adaptive management is increasingly argued to be key for dealing with uncertainty and complexity in social-ecological systems (Schultz et al., 2015), and our quantitative and qualitative findings support such an approach. This speaks to an ongoing tension in the restoration and conservation literature between those who wish to standardise 'best practice' approaches, and those who wish to maintain flexibility (Aronson et al., 2018; Higgs et al., 2018; Wunder et al., 2018). Our findings support adaptive management as one of the core principles of FLR (Besseau et al., 2018). We contend that all initial designs and predictions of restoration and other land management projects are likely to turn out to be at least a little inaccurate in practice—investing in adaptive project processes to adjust and correct interventions over time will therefore be key.

## Conclusion

Our work offers novel evidence on the importance of social factors in driving outcomes in FLR and similar initiatives. We have shown across several hundred farms in three countries that the capability and knowledge of land users can drive outcomes alongside environmental factors—and that this is likely tied to the capacity of land users to respond and adapt to social-ecological shocks and stresses. While there are no doubt many other drivers of outcomes in our sites, and while the magnitude of the effects will likely vary across contexts, we argue that the consistency of our findings across three sites strengthens their relevance for other sites and programmes.

Broadly, we contend that restoration initiatives and similar land management programmes must build and maintain the adaptive capacity of smallholders and other local actors through both material and institutional support. Additionally, project designs, funding and rules must be flexible enough to support adaptive management in the context of continued uncertainty. Overall, we suggest that the field of 'restoration ecology' must become 'adaptive restoration social-ecology' if it is to succeed.

## References

Alkire, S., & Jahan, S. (2018). *The new global MPI 2018: Aligning with the sustainable*

481 *development goals.*

482 Altieri, M. A., & Toledo, V. M. (2011). The agroecological revolution in Latin America:

483 Rescuing nature, ensuring food sovereignty and empowering peasants. *Journal of*

484 *Peasant Studies*, 38(3), 587–612.

485 Aronson, J. C., Simberloff, D., Ricciardi, A., & Goodwin, N. (2018). Restoration science does

486 not need redefinition. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 2(6), 916.

487 Ashton, M. S., & Montagnini, F. (1999). The silvicultural basis for agroforestry systems. CRC

488 Press.

489 Baird, J., Jollineau, M., Plummer, R., & Valenti, J. (2016). Exploring agricultural advice

490 networks, beneficial management practices and water quality on the landscape: A

491 geospatial social-ecological systems analysis. *Land Use Policy*, 51, 236–243.

492 Besseau, P., Graham, S. and Christophersen, T., 2018. Restoring forests and landscapes:

493 the key to a sustainable future. *Global Partnership on Forest and Landscape*

494 *Restoration*, Vienna, Austria.

495 Birner, R., Davis, K., Pender, J., Nkonya, E., Anandajayasekeram, P., Ekboir, J., ... Benin,

496 S. (2009). From best practice to best fit: A framework for designing and analyzing

497 pluralistic agricultural advisory services worldwide. *Journal of Agricultural Education*

498 and Extension, 15(4), 341–355.

499 Bode, M., Tulloch, A. I., Mills, M., Venter, O., & W. Ando, A. (2015). A conservation planning

500 approach to mitigate the impacts of leakage from protected area networks.

501 *Conservation Biology*, 29(3), 765–774.

502 Brudvig, L. A., Barak, R. S., Bauer, J. T., Caughlin, T. T., Laughlin, D. C., Larios, L., ...

503 Zirbel, C. R. (2017). Interpreting variation to advance predictive restoration science.

504 *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 54(4), 1018–1027.

505 Baynes, J., Herbohn, J. and Unsworth, W. (2017). Reforesting the grasslands of Papua New

506 Guinea: The importance of a family-based approach. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 56,

507 pp.124-131.

508 Chave, J., Coomes, D., Jansen, S., Lewis, S. L., Swenson, N. G., & Zanne, A. E. (2009).

- 509 Towards a worldwide wood economics spectrum. *Ecol Lett*, 12(4), 351–66.
- 510 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01285.x>
- 511 Chave, J., Rejou-Mechain, M., Burquez, A., Chidumayo, E., Colgan, M. S., Delitti, W. B., ...
- 512 Vieilledent, G. (2014). Improved allometric models to estimate the aboveground
- 513 biomass of tropical trees. *Glob Chang Biol*, 20(10), 3177–90.
- 514 <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12629>
- 515 Chazdon, R. L., Brancalion, P. H., Laestadius, L., Bennett-Curry, A., Buckingham, K.,
- 516 Kumar, C., ... Wilson, S. J. (2016). When is a forest a forest? Forest concepts and
- 517 definitions in the era of forest and landscape restoration. *Ambio*, 45(5), 538–550.
- 518 Chazdon, R. L., Brancalion, P. H., Lamb, D., Laestadius, L., Calmon, M., & Kumar, C.
- 519 (2017). A policy-driven knowledge agenda for global forest and landscape
- 520 restoration. *Conservation Letters*, 10(1), 125–132.
- 521 Chazdon, R. and Brancalion, P. (2019). Restoring forests as a means to many ends.
- 522 *Science*, 365(6448), 24-25.
- 523 Clark, W. C., Tomich, T. P., van Noordwijk, M., Guston, D., Catacutan, D., Dickson, N. M., &
- 524 McNie, E. (2011). Boundary work for sustainable development: Natural resource
- 525 management at the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
- 526 (CGIAR). *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0900231108>
- 527 Corona-Núñez, R. O., Campo, J., & Williams, M. (2018). Aboveground carbon storage in
- 528 tropical dry forest plots in Oaxaca, Mexico. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 409,
- 529 202–214.
- 530 De Jong, B. H. J., Montoyagomez, G., Nelson, K., & Soto-Pinto, L. (1995). Community
- 531 Forest Management and Carbon Sequestration—A Feasibility Study from Chiapas,
- 532 Mexico. *Interciencia*, 20(6), 409.
- 533 Díaz, S., Pascual, U., Stenseke, M., Martín-López, B., Watson, R. T., Molnár, Z., ...
- 534 Brauman, K. A. (2018). Assessing nature's contributions to people. *Science*,
- 535 359(6373), 270–272.
- 536 Dupuy, J. M., Hernández-Stefanoni, J. L., Hernández-Juárez, R. A., Tetetla-Rangel, E.,

- 537 López-Martínez, J. O., Leyequién-Abarca, E., ... May-Pat, F. (2012). Patterns and  
538 correlates of tropical dry forest structure and composition in a highly replicated  
539 chronosequence in Yucatan, Mexico. *Biotropica*, 44(2), 151–162.
- 540 ECOTRUST. (2018). Annual Report: Trees for Global Benefits, 2018. ECOTRUST.
- 541 Erdmann, T. K. (2005). Agroforestry as a tool for restoring forest landscapes. In *Forest  
542 Restoration in Landscapes* (pp. 274–284). Springer.
- 543 Ezzine-de-Blas, D., Wunder, S., Ruiz-Pérez, M., & del Pilar Moreno-Sanchez, R. (2016).  
544 Global patterns in the implementation of payments for environmental services. *PloS  
545 One*, 11(3).
- 546 Geist, C., & Galatowitsch, S. M. (1999). Reciprocal model for meeting ecological and human  
547 needs in restoration projects. *Conservation Biology*, 13(5), 970–979.
- 548 Goetz, S. J., Hansen, M., Houghton, R. A., Walker, W., Laporte, N., & Busch, J. (2015).  
549 Measurement and monitoring needs, capabilities and potential for addressing  
550 reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation under REDD+.  
551 *Environmental Research Letters*, 10(12).
- 552 Hegde, R., Bull, G. Q., Wunder, S., & Kozak, R. A. (2015). Household participation in a  
553 payments for environmental services programme: The Nhambita Forest Carbon  
554 Project (Mozambique). *Environment and Development Economics*, 20(5), 611–629.
- 555 Higgs, E. S., Harris, J. A., Heger, T., Hobbs, R. J., Murphy, S. D., & Suding, K. N. (2018).  
556 Keep ecological restoration open and flexible. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 2(4), 580.
- 557 Huber-Stearns, H. R., Bennett, D. E., Posner, S., Richards, R. C., Fair, J. H., Cousins, S. J.,  
558 & Romulo, C. L. (2017). Social-ecological enabling conditions for payments for  
559 ecosystem services. *Ecology and Society*, 22(1).
- 560 Iwamura, T., le Polain de Waroux, Y. and Mascia, M.B. (2018). Considering people in  
561 systematic conservation planning: insights from land system science. *Frontiers in  
562 Ecology and the Environment*, 16(7), 388-396.
- 563 INEGI. (2018). Continuo de Elevaciones Mexicano 3.0 (CEM 3.0). Retrieved from  
564 <http://www.inegi.org.mx/geo/contenidos/datosrelieve/continental/continuoelevaciones>

- 565 .aspx
- 566 Kastenholz, E., & Rogrigues, A. (2007). Discussing the potential benefits of hiking tourism in  
567 Portugal. *Anatolia*, 18(1), 5–21.
- 568 Kibler, K. M., Cook, G. S., Chambers, L. G., Donnelly, M., Hawthorne, T. L., Rivera, F. I., &  
569 Walters, L. (2018). Integrating sense of place into ecosystem restoration: A novel  
570 approach to achieve synergistic social-ecological impact. *Ecology and Society*, 23(4).  
571 <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-10542-230425>
- 572 Kowarik, A., & Templ, M. (2016). Imputation with the R Package VIM. *Journal of Statistical*  
573 *Software*, 74(7), 1–16.
- 574 Krishna, A. (2004). Understanding, measuring and utilizing social capital: Clarifying concepts  
575 and presenting a field application from India. *Agricultural Systems*, 82(3), 291–305.
- 576 Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P. B., & Christensen, R. H. B. (2017). lmerTest package: Tests in  
577 linear mixed effects models. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 82(13).
- 578 Lamb, D., Erskine, P. D., & Parrotta, J. A. (2005). Restoration of degraded tropical forest  
579 landscapes. *Science*, 310(5754), 1628–1632.
- 580 Le, H. D., Smith, C., Herbohn, J., & Harrison, S. (2012). More than just trees: Assessing  
581 reforestation success in tropical developing countries. *Journal of Rural Studies*,  
582 28(1), 5–19.
- 583 Le, H.D., Smith, C. and Herbohn, J. (2014). What drives the success of reforestation projects  
584 in tropical developing countries? The case of the Philippines. *Global Environmental*  
585 *Change*, 24, 334–348.
- 586 López-Martínez, J. O., Hernández-Stefanoni, J. L., Dupuy, J. M., & Meave, J. A. (2013).  
587 Partitioning the variation of woody plant  $\beta$ -diversity in a landscape of secondary  
588 tropical dry forests across spatial scales. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, 24(1), 33–  
589 45.
- 590 Lowder, S. K., Skoet, J., & Raney, T. (2016). The number, size, and distribution of farms,  
591 smallholder farms, and family farms worldwide. *World Development*, 87, 16–29.
- 592 Mansourian, S. (2016). Understanding the relationship between governance and forest

- 593 landscape restoration. *Conservation and Society*, 14(3), 267.
- 594 Mansourian, S., Dudley, N., & Vallauri, D. (2017). Forest Landscape Restoration: Progress  
595 in the last decade and remaining challenges. *Ecological Restoration*, 35(4), 281–288.
- 596 Maschinski, J., Frye, R., & Rutman, S. (1997). Demography and population viability of an  
597 endangered plant species before and after protection from trampling. *Conservation  
598 Biology*, 11(4), 990–999.
- 599 Messier, C., Puettmann, K., Chazdon, R., Andersson, K. P., Angers, V. A., Brotons, L., ...  
600 Levin, S. A. (2015). From management to stewardship: Viewing forests as complex  
601 adaptive systems in an uncertain world. *Conservation Letters*, 8(5), 368–377.
- 602 Meyfroidt, P. (2016). Approaches and terminology for causal analysis in land systems  
603 science. *Journal of Land Use Science*, 11(5), 501–522.
- 604 Miller, J. R., & Hobbs, R. J. (2007). Habitat restoration—Do we know what we're doing?  
605 *Restoration Ecology*, 15(3), 382–390.
- 606 Morton, J. F. (2007). The impact of climate change on smallholder and subsistence  
607 agriculture. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(50), 19680–  
608 19685.
- 609 Mullan, K. and Kontoleon, A. (2012). Participation in Payments for Ecosystem Services  
610 programmes: accounting for participant heterogeneity. *Journal of Environmental  
611 Economics and Policy*, 1(3), 235–254.
- 612 Murray, C., & Marmorek, D. (2003). Adaptive management and ecological restoration.  
613 *Ecological Restoration of Southwestern Ponderosa Pine Forests*, 417–428.
- 614 Naeem, B. S., Ingram, J. C., Varga, A., Agardy, T., Barten, P., Bennett, G., ... Wunder, S.  
615 (2015). Get the science right when paying for nature's services. *Science*, 347(6227),  
616 1206–1207. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa1403>
- 617 Nahuelhual, L., Benra, F., Laterra, P., Marin, S., Arriagada, R., & Jullian, C. (2018). Patterns  
618 of ecosystem services supply across farm properties: Implications for ecosystem  
619 services-based policy incentives. *Science of the Total Environment*, 634, 941–950.
- 620 OPHI. (2015). Global MPI Country Briefing: Mexico, 2015. In *Multidimensional Poverty Index*

- 621 Data Bank. OPHI, University of Oxford.
- 622 OPHI. (2018a). Global MPI Country Briefing: Mozambique, 2018. In Multidimensional
- 623 Poverty Index Data Bank. OPHI, University of Oxford.
- 624 OPHI. (2018b). Global MPI Country Briefing: Uganda, 2018. In Multidimensional Poverty
- 625 Index Data Bank. OPHI, University of Oxford.
- 626 Paine, C., Marthews, T. R., Vogt, D. R., Purves, D., Rees, M., Hector, A., & Turnbull, L. A.
- 627 (2012). How to fit nonlinear plant growth models and calculate growth rates: An
- 628 update for ecologists. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 3(2), 245–256.
- 629 Pascual, U., Phelps, J., Garmendia, E., Brown, K., Corbera, E., Martin, A., ... Muradian, R.
- 630 (2014). Social Equity Matters in Payments for Ecosystem Services. *BioScience*,
- 631 64(11), 1027–1036. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biu146>
- 632 Perring, M. P., Standish, R. J., Price, J. N., Craig, M. D., Erickson, T. E., Ruthrof, K. X., ...
- 633 Hobbs, R. J. (2015). Advances in restoration ecology: Rising to the challenges of the
- 634 coming decades. *Ecosphere*, 6(8). <https://doi.org/10.1890/ES15-00121.1>
- 635 Persha, L., & Andersson, K. (2014). Elite capture risk and mitigation in decentralized forest
- 636 governance regimes. *Global Environmental Change*, 24, 265–276.
- 637 Plan Vivo. (2013). The Plan Vivo Standard for Community Payments for Ecosystem Services
- 638 Programmes [Report]. The Plan Vivo Foundation.
- 639 Poorter, L., Bongers, F., Aide, T. M., Zambrano, A. M. A., Balvanera, P., Becknell, J. M., ...
- 640 Chazdon, R. L. (2016). Biomass resilience of Neotropical secondary forests. *Nature*,
- 641 530(7589), 211.
- 642 Pritchard, R., Ryan, C. M., Grundy, I., & van der Horst, D. (2018). Human Appropriation of
- 643 Net Primary Productivity and Rural Livelihoods: Findings From Six Villages in
- 644 Zimbabwe. *Ecological Economics*, 146, 115–124.
- 645 Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., Nicholls, C. M., Ormston, R., & others. (2013). Qualitative research
- 646 practice: A guide for social science students and researchers. Sage Publications.
- 647 R Core Team. (2019). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Retrieved
- 648 from <http://www.R-project.org/>

- Redmond, M. (2015). R script for calculating potential and actual evapotranspiration and climatic water deficit at a monthly time step at sites. Retrieved from [https://naes.unr.edu/weisberg/old\\_site/downloads/](https://naes.unr.edu/weisberg/old_site/downloads/)
- Rejou-Mechain, M., Tanguy, A., Piponit, C., Chave, J., & Herault, B. (2018). BIOMASS: Estimating Aboveground Biomass and Its Uncertainty in Tropical Forests. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=BIOMASS>
- Robiglio, V., & Reyes, M. (2016). Restoration through formalization? Assessing the potential of Peru's Agroforestry Concessions scheme to contribute to restoration in agricultural frontiers in the Amazon region. *World Development Perspectives*, 3, 42–46.
- Ruiz-De-Oña-Plaza, C., Soto-Pinto, L., Paladino, S., Morales, F., & Esquivel, E. (2011). Constructing public policy in a participatory manner: From local carbon sequestration projects to network governance in Chiapas, Mexico. In *Carbon Sequestration Potential of Agroforestry Systems* (pp. 247–262). Springer.
- Ryan, C. M., Williams, M., & Grace, J. (2011). Above-and belowground carbon stocks in a miombo woodland landscape of Mozambique. *Biotropica*, 43(4), 423–432.
- Sapkota, R. P., Stahl, P. D., & Rijal, K. (2018). Restoration governance: An integrated approach towards sustainably restoring degraded ecosystems. *Environmental Development*, 27, 83–94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envdev.2018.07.001>
- Schroth, G., da Mota, M. do S. S., Hills, T., Soto-Pinto, L., Wijayanto, I., Arief, C. W., & Zepeda, Y. (2011). Linking carbon, biodiversity and livelihoods near forest margins: The role of agroforestry. In *Carbon Sequestration Potential of Agroforestry Systems* (pp. 179–200). Springer.
- Schultz, L., Folke, C., Österblom, H., & Olsson, P. (2015). Adaptive governance, ecosystem management, and natural capital. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(24), 7369–7374.
- Sexton, J. O., Song, X.-P., Feng, M., Noojipady, P., Anand, A., Huang, C., ... others. (2013). Global, 30-m resolution continuous fields of tree cover: Landsat-based rescaling of MODIS vegetation continuous fields with lidar-based estimates of error. *International*



- Journal of Digital Earth, 6(5), 427–448.
- Soule, M. (2013). The 'New Conservation'. *Conservation Biology*, 27(5), 895–897.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12147>
- Sorice, M. G., Kreuter, U. P., Wilcox, B. P., & Fox III, W. E. (2014). Changing landowners, changing ecosystem? Land-ownership motivations as drivers of land management practices. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 133, 144–152.
- Stephanson, S.L. and Mascia, M.B. (2014). Putting people on the map through an approach that integrates social data in conservation planning. *Conservation biology*, 28(5), 1236–1248.
- Suding, K., Higgs, E., Palmer, M., Callicott, J. B., Anderson, C. B., Baker, M., ... Larson, B. M. (2015). Committing to ecological restoration. *Science*, 348(6235), 638–640.
- Temperton, V. M., Buchmann, N., Buisson, E., Durigan, G., Kazmierczak, Ł., Perring, M. P., ... Overbeck, G. E. (2019). Step back from the forest and step up to the Bonn Challenge: How a broad ecological perspective can promote successful landscape restoration. *Restoration Ecology*, 27(4), 705–719.
- Thiault, L., Gelcich, S., Cinner, J. E., Tapia-Lewin, S., Chlous, F., & Claudet, J. (2019). Generic and specific facets of vulnerability for analysing trade-offs and synergies in natural resource management. *People and Nature*.
- Tittonell, P., Vanlauwe, B., Leffelaar, P., Rowe, E. C., & Giller, K. E. (2005). Exploring diversity in soil fertility management of smallholder farms in western Kenya: I. Heterogeneity at region and farm scale. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 110(3), 149–165.
- USGS. (2006). Shuttle Radar Topography Mission 1 Arc Second scenes, Uganda and Mozambique. Global Land Cover Facility, University of Maryland.
- Van Oosten, C. (2013). Forest landscape restoration: Who decides? A governance approach to forest landscape restoration. *Nat. Conserv*, 1, 119–126.
- Van Oosten, C. (2013b). Restoring landscapes—Governing place: A learning approach to forest landscape restoration. *Journal of Sustainable Forestry*, 32(7), 659–676.

- Walker, L. R., Wardle, D. A., Bardgett, R. D., & Clarkson, B. D. (2010). The use of chronosequences in studies of ecological succession and soil development. *Journal of Ecology*, 98(4), 725–736.
- White, S. C. (2010). Analysing wellbeing: A framework for development practice. *Development in Practice*, 20(2), 158–172.
- Willmott, Cort J., & Matsuura, K. (2014). Terrestrial air temperature and precipitation: Monthly and annual time series (1950-2014). U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA.
- Woollen, E., Ryan, C. M., & Williams, M. (2012). Carbon stocks in an African woodland landscape: Spatial distributions and scales of variation. *Ecosystems*, 15(5), 804–818.
- Wortley, L., Hero, J.-M., & Howes, M. (2013). Evaluating ecological restoration success: A review of the literature. *Restoration Ecology*, 21(5), 537–543.
- Wunder, S., Brouwer, R., Engel, S., Ezzine-de-Blas, D., Muradian, R., Pascual, U., & Pinto, R. (2018). From principles to practice in paying for nature's services. *Nature Sustainability*, 1(3).
- Yackulic, C.B., Fagan, M., Jain, M., Jina, A., Lim, Y., Marlier, M., Muscarella, R., Adame, P., DeFries, R. and Uriarte, M. (2011). Biophysical and socioeconomic factors associated with forest transitions at multiple spatial and temporal scales. *Ecology and Society*, 16(3).
- Yin, R., Liu, T., Yao, S., & Zhao, M. (2013). Designing and implementing payments for ecosystem services programs: Lessons learned from China's cropland restoration experience. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 35, 66–72.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2013.06.010>
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Los Angeles.
- Yin, R., Yin, G. and Li, L., 2010. Assessing China's ecological restoration programs: what's been done and what remains to be done?. *Environmental Management*, 45(3), pp.442-453.
- Zuur, A. F., Ieno, E. N., & Smith, G. M. (2007). *Analysing ecological data*. New York ;

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

733 London: Springer.

734

Accepted Manuscript